

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Prior to the entry of this Amendment, claims 1, 7-14, 16, 20-25, 27, 31-36, 38, 39, 41-44, 46-49, and 51-53 were pending in this application. Claims 1, 8, 16, 21, 27, 32, 38, 42-43, 47-48, and 52 have been amended, no claims have been canceled, and no claims have been added herein. Therefore, claims 1, 7-14, 16, 20-25, 27, 31-36, 38, 39, 41-44, 46-49, and 51-53 are now pending in this application. Applicants request reconsideration of these claims for at least the reasons presented below.

35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejection, Indefinite

The Office Action has rejected claims 42, 47 and 52 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. More specifically, the Office Action rejects claims 42, 47 and 52 alleging that there is insufficient antecedent basis in the claims for the phrases “the request” and “the workflow.” Applicants submit that amendments have been made herein that are thought to overcome the reasons for the rejection. Specifically, the terms upon which the reason for the rejection have been based have been amended herein. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection, Hardy

The Office Action rejected claims 1, 7-14, 16, 20-25, 27, 31-36, 38, 39, 41-44, 46-49, and 51-53 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U. S. Patent No. 6,073,242 to Hardy et al. (hereinafter “Hardy”). The Applicants respectfully submit the following arguments pointing out significant differences between claims 1, 7-14, 16, 20-25, 27, 31-36, 38, 39, 41-44, 46-49, and 51-53 submitted by the Applicant and Hardy.

“A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” MPEP 2131 citing *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Applicant respectfully argues that Hardy fails to disclose each and every claimed element. For example, Hardy fails to disclose, either expressly or inherently, a workflow for performing a certificate related action that calls for approval from an entity associated with the user. Hardy also fails to disclose such an entity identified in a user profile for the user. Hardy does not disclose one of the workflows requiring approval for a certificate action while another does not. That is, Hardy does not disclose, expressly or inherently, selecting workflows that handle certificate related requests differently, i.e., requiring or not requiring approval from an entity associated with a requesting user, based on the type of user requesting the action.

Hardy is directed to “an authority server that supports the implementation of role-based enterprise policies for expressing and exercising authority and the projection and transfer of those authorities over networks of communicating electronic systems.” (Col. 3, line 23-27) Under Hardy, “the authority server exclusively embodies the authorities of the enterprise and allows its users to indirectly wield those authorities only as permitted by enterprise policies.” (Col. 3, lines 28-31) That is, Hardy describes issuing representations of authority based on application of enterprise policies. See generally col. 3, line 23 – col. 4, line 51.

However, Hardy fails to disclose, either expressly or inherently, a workflow for performing a certificate related action that calls for approval from an entity associated with the user. Hardy also fails to disclose such an entity identified in a user profile for the user. Hardy does not disclose one of the workflows requiring approval for a certificate action while another does not. That is, Hardy does not disclose, expressly or inherently, selecting workflows that handle certificate related requests differently, i.e., requiring or not requiring approval from an entity associated with a requesting user, based on the type of user requesting the action. Rather, Hardy describes issuing representations of authority based on a set of enterprise policies but

without mentioning obtaining approval from an entity associated with the requestor, identified in an identity profile for the requestor or otherwise.

Claim 1, upon which claims 2-15 depend, claim 16, upon which claims 17-26 depend, and claim 27, upon which claims 28-37 depend, each recite in part “retrieving by the Identity System a first workflow for responding to said request from a plurality of workflows for responding to requests for certificate related actions, wherein each workflow in said plurality of workflows corresponds to a different set of characteristics for a user, wherein the first workflow contains a first set of directives and a second workflow in said plurality of workflows contains a second set of directives, wherein said first set of directives is different from said second set of directives, wherein said first workflow calls for obtaining an approval from an entity associated with the first user and identified in a user profile for the first user maintained by the Identity System before performing a certificate related action, wherein said second workflow does not call for obtaining an approval before performing a certificate related action, wherein said first workflow for responding to said request corresponds to said first certificate related action and a set of characteristics for said first user from ~~an~~ the identity profile for the first, the set of characteristics for the first user including a user type for the first user, and wherein retrieving the first workflow further comprises selecting the first workflow from the plurality of workflows based on the first certificate related action and the user type of the first user.” Hardy fails to disclose, either expressly or inherently, each of these claimed elements. For example, Hardy fails to disclose a workflow for performing a certificate related action that calls for approval from an entity associated with the user. Hardy also fails to disclose such an entity identified in a user profile for the user. Hardy does not disclose one of the workflows requiring approval for a certificate action while another does not. That is, Hardy does not disclose, expressly or inherently, selecting workflows that handle certificate related requests differently, i.e., requiring or not requiring approval from an entity associated with a requesting user, based on the type of user requesting the action. For at least these reasons, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 1, 3-14, 16, 18-25, 27, and 29-36.

Claim 38, upon which claims 39-42 depend, claim 43, upon which claims 44-47 depend, and claim 48, upon which claims 49-52 depend, each recite in part “receiving a first request for a first certificate related action for a first user; retrieving a first workflow for responding to said first request from a plurality of workflows, wherein said first workflow corresponds to said first certificate related action and a set of characteristics for said first user, wherein each workflow in said plurality of workflows corresponds to a different set of characteristics for a user, wherein said first workflow calls for obtaining an approval from an entity associated with the first user before performing a certificate related action, wherein a second workflow of the plurality of workflows does not call for obtaining an approval before performing a certificate related action, and wherein retrieving the first workflow for responding to said first request further comprises selecting the first workflow from the plurality of workflows based on the first certificate related action and a user type of the first user; performing said first workflow, wherein performing said first workflow comprises retrieving an approval response from the entity associated with the first user and obtaining a certificate; receiving a second request for a second certificate related action for a second user; retrieving a second workflow for responding to said second request from said plurality of workflows, wherein said second workflow corresponds to said second certificate related action and a user type of said second user; and performing said second workflow, wherein performing said second workflow comprises obtaining a second certificate without retrieving an approval response.” Hardy fails to disclose, either expressly or inherently, each of these claimed elements. For example, Hardy fails to disclose a workflow for performing a certificate related action that calls for approval from an entity associated with the user. Hardy also fails to disclose one of the workflows requiring approval for a certificate action while another does not. That is, Hardy does not disclose, expressly or inherently, selecting workflows that handle certificate related requests differently, i.e., requiring or not requiring approval from an entity associated with a requesting user, based on the type of user requesting the action. For at least these reasons, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 38-52.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance and an action to that end is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 303-571-4000.

Dated: November 19, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

/William J. Daley/
William J. Daley
Reg. No. 52,471

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 303-571-4000 (Denver office)
Fax: 303-571-4321 (Denver office)
WJD:jep

61592577 v1